INDEX

A

Accountability: Cooperative Extension and, 12, 22–23, 62, 108; evaluation for, 48; funding and, 35; government pressures for, 22–23, 34, 72
Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act (AREERA), 23
Aguilar, C., 92
Ahrens-Gary, P., 33
Alkin, M. C., 32
American Evaluation Association, (AEA), 2, 23, 109, 114
AmeriCorps National Community Civilian Corps, 35
Andersen, M. A.,
Andrews, M., 22
Apps, J., 7
Arnold, M., 59
Arnold, M. E., 3, 4, 59, 60, 71, 86, 113, 114
Axinn, G., 10

B

Baiserman, M., 56
Ballard, F. L., 17
Beal, G. M., 19
Bedian, A., 12
Behavioral change theories, Cooperative Extension and, 19–20
Bennett, C., 20, 21, 64
Bennett, C. F., 30, 73 *t*
Berk, R. A., 108
Betz, D. L., 97
Block, A., 82
Bloom, B. S., 19
Bohlen, J. M., 19
Bolin, P., 98
Boyd, H., 42, 43, 45, 46, 57, 59, 63
Boyd, H. H., 2, 55, 69, 106, 111, 113
Boyer, E. L., 6
Boyle, R., 65
Braverman, M. T., 3, 4, 71, 75, 82, 86, 113, 114
Brink, M. S., 82
Bronfenbrenner, U., 20
Buford, J., 12,
Burton, R. M., 42

C

California Department of Education (CDE), 32
Calvert, M., 59, 95
Campbell, D. T., 73 *t*
Campoy, R., 34
Capacity building. *See* Evaluation capacity building, in Cooperative Extension
Chatterji, M., 75
Chelimsky, E., 43, 44, 45, 52, 75, 81
Christenson, J. A., 18, 22
Clark, S., 56
Clavijo, K., 91, 92
Clifford, D. L., 44
Compton, D., 56
Conklin, N., 9, 17
Contribution analysis, 110
Cook, T. D., 73*t*
Cooksey, L. J., 2, 27, 39, 106, 110, 111
Cooperative Extension System (CES): accountability and, 12, 22–23; agriculture and, 9; autonomy and, 13; clientele of, 9; college-university partnership arrangements and, 8; content transmission and, 11; educational approaches and, 10–11, 10*fig*; Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program and, 32, 34; Extension Education Evaluation Topical Interest Group and, 23; facilitation approach and, 11; 4-H program and, 5, 7, 9, 11, 16; funding structure of, 7, 8*fig*; global extensions and, 102–103; land-grant university system and, 6–7, 16; local support for, 12; mission of, 5–6, 101; Morrill Act and, 6; multifaceted structure of, 7–8; operational levels and, 12; origins of, 6; program development model and, 11–12; program evaluation and, 13; program partnerships and, 9–10; programmatic foci of, 9, 16–17; reach of, 6, 17–18; role of educators and, 8–9, 108; service domain and, 10; Smith-Lever Act and, 7, 16; social role of, 9; staffing structure of, 8–9, 8*t*; stakeholders and, 13, 30; transformative education and, 11; U.S. Department of Agriculture and, 7, 16, 30, 38; volunteers and, 9, 93–94. *See also* Educators, in Cooperative Extension; Program evaluation, and Cooperative Extension; 4-H program
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES), 31, 32, 38n, 82
Cotton, D., 58
Cousins, B., 56
Cousins, J. B., 113
Cox, G., 94
Cummings, T. G., 42, 43
Customer satisfaction, Cooperative Extension and, 18–19

D

Del Tredici, A., 82
Del Tredici, A. M., 82
Dennis, M. L., 74*t*
DeSanctis, G., 42
DiClemente, C. C., 20
Dollahite, J., 96
Donaldson, S. I., 32
Douglah, M., 59, 63

Duttweiler, M., 58
Duttweiler, M. W., 3, 87, 100, 103, 110, 111, 114

E
Earl, L., 67
Educational objectives, Bloom's taxonomy of, 19
Educators, in Cooperative Extension: accountability of, 108; expertise of, 78; objectivity of, 43; professional development and, 58–60; role of, 8–9, 44–46, 48–49, 52–53, 57, 79–80, 108; successful vs. unsuccessful roles of, 45
Elliott, E., 58
Engle, M., 2, 4, 15, 26, 59, 109
European Evaluation Society (EES), 114
Evaluation. *See* Evaluation capacity building (ECB); Evaluation practice; Methodological rigor, in evaluation; Program evaluation
Evaluation capacity building (ECB): definition of, 56; framework for, in complex organizational settings, 58–63, 58*t*; goal of, 56; organizational environment and, 62–63; practitioner role and, 57; pressures for, 56–57; professional development and, 58–60; program evaluation vs. ECB and, 57; recommendations about, 66–68; resources and supports and, 60–62; theory of change model and, 67*t*. *See also* Evaluation capacity building, in Cooperative Extension
Evaluation capacity building, in Cooperative Extension: collaborative evaluation projects and, 59; communication and, 63; communities of practice and, 60; data management and, 63; demand for accountability and, 62; ECB expertise and, 60; ECB framework in complex organizational settings and, 58–63, 58*t*; ECB practitioner roles and, 57; evaluation and, 66; evaluation champions and, 61; evaluation materials and, 60; external demands and, 56; financing and, 61; internal demands and, 56–57; leadership and, 62; logic model for, 64–66; mentoring/coaching and, 60; organizational assets and, 61; organizational environment and, 62–63; organizational structures and, 63; performance incentives and, 62–63; policy guidelines and, 63; practitioner training and, 59; pressures for best practice and, 57; professional development and, 58–60; recommendations about, 66–68; resources and supports and, 60–62; teamwork and, 63; technical assistance and, 59; technology and, 61; theory of change model and, 67*t*; time management and, 61–62; University of Wisconsin case example and, 63–66. *See also* Evaluation capacity building (ECB)
Evaluation practice: evaluation purpose and, 90*t*; levels of evaluation and, 90*t*; review of published studies and, 88–91; 4-H youth development and, 94–95; capacity building and, 98, 113; change in, 108–110; collaborative efforts and, 92–93; community resources and, 94; competing purposes and, 110–112; connecting extension and evaluation processes and, 103–104, 103*t*; contribution analysis and, 110; differing criteria and, 104–105; diverse audiences and, 93; educator influence and, 93; evaluation criteria and, 105*t*; Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program and, 96–97; extension principles and, 104*t*; facilitating factors for, 98–99; farmer's markets and, 94; influence of evaluation studies and, 91–99, 109–110; *Journal of Extension*, 88, 89, 91, 93. *See also* Evaluation practice, in Cooperative Extension
Evaluation practice, in Cooperative Extension: logic modeling and, 108–109; making connections and, 103–104, 109–110; measures of agricultural extension program success and, 105*t*; Michigan Apple Committee and, 92; organizational schizophrenia and, 111–112; organizational structure and, 92; Outcome Mapping and, 110; priority outcomes debate and, 106–108; program impact and, 96; review of published studies and, 88–91; strengthening, 97; University of Wisconsin Extension's 4-H Youth Development program and, 95–96; utility standards and, 104 *t*; volunteer recruitment and, 93–94; Washington State Extension's Strengthening Families Program for Parents and Youth and, 97. *See also* Evaluation practice
Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP), 32, 34, 81–83, 96–97
Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP), 23

F
Faddis, B. J., 33
Fleming, M. L., 91
Food and Agriculture Act, 22
Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), of the United Nations, 43, 105; 4-H program, 3, 7, 9, 11, 16. *See also* Cooperative Extension System (CES); Minnesota 4-H Youth Development Program; University of Wisconsin Extension's 4-H Youth Development program
Franz, N. K., 2, 5, 10, 11, 14
Freeman, H. E., 35, 36
Fry, R., 19
Funding: accountability and, 35; competitive environment for, 24; Cooperative Extension structure for, 7, 8*fig*; multilevel, 27–28, 35; single-level vs. multiple-level programs and, 36; Title I and, 35

G
Galbraith, J. R., 42
Gates, S. M., 42
Gilmour, J. B., 34
Goh, S., 56
Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), 18, 33–34, 111
Graham, D., 9, 17
Gregory, P., 93
Griffith, W., 6
Guion, L., 42, 43, 45, 46, 57, 60
Gundermann, D., 59

H
Hamilton, G., 35, 36
Head Start Family Child Care Demonstration projects, 33
Henert, E., 65
Henry, G., 66, 109
Henry, G. T., 32
Hill, L. G., 97
Hoermann, E. F., 91
Huebner, T. A., 85

I
Iman, I., 109
Institute of Education Sciences, 77
Internal evaluation. *See* Organizational structure and internal program evaluation, Cooperative Extension System and (study)
International Development Research Centre (IDRC), 110
Israel, G. D., 19

J
Jacobs, F., 89, 90
Jayraj, A., 94
Johnson, K., 91
Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 104
Jones, L., 65
Journal of Extension (*JOE*), 88, 89, 91, 93, 111
Joy, A. B., 82
Julnes, G., 32, 66

K
KASAs (knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations), 106
Katz, S., 67
Kefford, B., 43
Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, 25
Kelsey, K. D., 98
King, J., 56, 58, 61, 62
King, J. A., 56, 62, 64, 66
King, N. J., 2, 27, 39, 106, 110, 111
Kirkhart, K., 109
Knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations (KASAs), 106
Knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors (KSABs), 32
Knowles, M. S., 17, 19
Kolb, D., 19
KSABs (knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors), 32

L
Lambur, M. T., 2, 30, 32, 41, 54, 111
Land-grant university system: 4-H program and, 7; American Indian colleges and, 7; Cooperative Extension and, 6–7; mission of, 6; Morrill Act and, 6; national competitiveness and, 6; number of colleges in, 7; Smith-Lever Act and, 7, 16
Laughlin, S. G., 82
Learning theories, Cooperative Extension and, 19
Lee, L, 56
Lemaire, D., 65
Lindner, J., 12
Lipsey, M. W., 35, 36, 73*t*, 74*t*
Logic modeling: description of, 21; ECB theory of change, 67*t*; evaluation capacity building and, 64–66; pervasiveness of, 108–109; program development and, 21; program evaluation and, 21; theories of change and, 109–110
Love, A. J., 42, 44, 45

M
Mackay, K., 66
Mager, R. F., 19
Majchrzak, A., 43
Marczak, M., 59
Mark, M., 66, 109
Mark, M. M., 32
Martinez, L. I., 94
Matthews, B., 59
Mayeske, G. W., 30, 32
Mayne, J.,
McDonald, B., 43
Medeiros, L., 65
Merriam, S. B., 30, 32
Methodological rigor, in Cooperative Extension evaluation: California EFNEP Evaluation (case example), 81–83; implementation challenges and, 81; Minnesota 4-H Youth Survey (case example), 83–84. *See also* Methodological rigor, in evaluation
Methodological rigor, in evaluation: appropriateness and, 114–115; burden on participants and, 76–77; consensus and debate about, 75; costs of, 75; decisions about data and, 72, 75; defending methodology and, 80–81; definition of, 72; determining program quality and, 79; determining standards of, 78–79; educating organization about, 81; educating stakeholders about, 80; elements of, 72, 73–74*t*; evaluator expertise and, 78; evaluator role and, 79–81; factors driving decisions about, 75–78; formal program acceptance and, 77–78; funder requirements and, 77; interpreting findings and, 80; negotiating decision making about, 80; opportunities for applying, 77; organizational culture and, 78; organizational expectations about, 78–79; professional standards and, 77; randomized control trials and, 84, 114; recommendations about, 84; selecting methodology for, 79; time constraints and, 76. *See also* Methodological rigor, in Cooperative Extension evaluation
Michigan Apple Committee, 92
Milstein, B., 58
Mincemoyer, C., 94, 95
Minnesota Department of Education, 83
Minnesota 4-H Program, 83
Morrill Act, 6
Multilevel program evaluation: adoption behavior vs. program effectiveness and, 34; AmeriCorps

National Community Civilian Corps and, 35; California Department of Education and, 32; challenges of, 28, 36–38; Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service and, 31; creative evaluation design and, 38; description of intervention and, 31–32, 37; efficiency in, 37; Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program and, 32, 34; formal vs. informal stakeholder involvement and, 30–31; funding accountability and, 35; Government Performance and Results Act and, 33–34; Head Start Family Child Care Demonstration projects and, 33; implications for, 36–38; integrated pest management program and, 34; multilevel support networks and, 37–38; National Evaluation of Welfare to Work strategies and, 35–36; opportunities and, 37–38; PART ratings and, 34–35; performance indicators and, 33; program costs and, 35–36; program description and, 32, 37; program impact and, 33–35; program participants and, 31–32, 37; program plans and, 30; reputational sampling for stakeholder identification and, 31; research themes in, 28, 29*t*; stakeholder education and, 38; stakeholders and, 28, 30–31, 36–37; Temporary Aid to Needy Families and, 27–28; U.S. Department of Agriculture's Annual Performance Report and, 33. *See also* Multilevel program evaluation, Cooperative Extension and; Multilevel programs; Program evaluation

Multilevel program evaluation, Cooperative Extension and: pitfalls and opportunities for, 37–38; program impact and, 34; programs involving, 28; stakeholders and, 30–32. *See also* Multilevel program evaluation

Multilevel programs: definition of, 27–28; examples of, 27–28

N

National Evaluation of Welfare to Work strategies, 35–36

National Task Force on the Extension Accountability and Evaluation System, 23

Network of Networks on Impact Evaluation, (NONIE), 114

O

O'Neill, M., 58

Obel, B., 42

Ohio State University Extension, 9

Omelich, C., 82

Omelich, C. L., 82

Organizational design, elements of, 42

Organizational structure: definition of, 42; internal evaluation and, 42; organizational design and, 42; structural factors and, 42–46. *See also* Organizational structure and internal program evaluation, Cooperative Extension System and (study); Organizational structure, and program evaluation

Organizational structure and internal program evaluation, Cooperative Extension and (study): accountability and, 48; capacity building and, 48; decision-making and planning functions and, 44; department structure and, 50; evaluation structure and, 47, 47*t*; evaluation unit–top management connection and, 43–44, 49–53; evaluator interview and, 46–47; evaluator objectivity and, 43; evaluator roles/responsibilites and, 44–46, 48–49, 52–53; functions of evaluation unit, 44; implications, 51–53; in-house vs. out-of-house evaluator placement and, 43–44; internal evaluation units and, 49–52; limitations of, 46–47; optimizing, 50–51; organizational location of evaluation unit and, 43; perceived effects and, 49–50; philosophy/approach to evaluation and, 48–49; placement of evaluation function within organization and, 43–44; primary evaluator activities and, 45–46; program planning and, 46; recommendations, 46; scope and reporting lines and, 47, 47*t*; successful vs. unsuccessful evaluator roles and, 45; structural factors and, 42; utilization-focused approach and, 45. *See also* Organizational structure; Program evaluation, in Cooperative Extension

Outcome mapping, 110

P

Patton, M. Q., 3, 28, 30, 44, 45, 52, 56, 62, 75, 79, 101, 103, 108, 109, 110, 113, 114, 115

Perkins, D. F., 94, 95

Persaud, N., 35

Preskill, H., 1, 56, 59, 61, 81

Prochaska, J. O., 20

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART), 34, 111

Program evaluation: accountability and, 34; adoption behavior vs. program effectiveness and, 34; description of intervention and, 31–32; Program Assessment Rating Tool and, 34, 111; program costs and, 35–36; program description and, 30, 32; program impact and, 33–35; program plans and, 30. *See also* Cooperative Extension and; Evaluation capacity building (ECB); Internal evaluation; Multilevel program evaluation; Organizational structure and internal program evaluation; Program evaluation, Organizational structure, and program evaluation

Program evaluation, Cooperative Extension and: Food and Agriculture Act and, 22; accountability demands and, 22–23; Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act and, 23; behavioral change theories and, 19–20; Bennett's results hierarchy and, 20–21; changing role/goals of, 16–17; commitment to, 23–25; competitive funding environment and, 24; customer satisfaction ratings and, 18–19; evaluation research paradigm and, 23; evaluation specialists and, 23–24; evaluation standards and, 104*t*; extension approaches and, 105*t*; Extension Committee on Organization and Policy and, 23; external pressures and, 22–24; first national assessment and, 18;

Government Performance and Results Act and, 18; internal decision making and, 24; leadership and, 23; learning theories and, 19; logic modeling and, 21–22; outcomes debate and, 106–108; program evaluation and, 21–22; program maturity and, 24–25; programmatic diversity and, 16–17; relationships and, 17–18; service goal and, 24; system reform and, 24; systems theory and, 20. *See also* Cooperative Extension System (CES); Evaluation capacity building, in Cooperative Extension; Multilevel program evaluation, Cooperative Extension and; Organizational structure and internal program evaluation, Cooperative Extension and (study); Program evaluation; Program evaluation, Cooperative Extension and

R

Randall, M. J., 82
Rasmussen, W., 6
Reck, F. M., 6, 7
Reeder, R. L.,
Rennekamp, R., 2, 4, 15, 22, 26, 42, 43, 45, 46, 57, 109
Results hierarchy, theory of, 20–21
Rist, R., 65
Robbins, S. P., 42
Rockwell, K., 21, 73*t*
Rogers, E. M., 19
Rogers, P., 43
Rogers, P. J., 73*t*
Rossi, P. H., 35, 36, 108
Russ-Eft, D., 1, 81

S

St. Pierre, R. G., 74 t
Sanders, J. R., 1
Sandison, P., 96, 98
Scheirer, M. A., 1
Scheurich, J. J., 34
Schnelle, M., 98
Schweigert, F. J., 72
Scott-Pierce, M., 96
Scriven, M., 43, 52
Seevers, B., 9, 17
Shadish, W. R., 73*t*
Sherman, P., 44
Skrla, L., 34
Smith, J. A., 16
Smith-Lever Act, 7, 16
Society for Prevention Research, 77
Sonnichsen, R. D., 43
Stake, R. E., 28, 30, 33
Stakeholders: Cooperative Extension, 30; definition of, 29, 30; diversity of, 30; interest of, in program impact, 33; program plans and, 30; reputational sampling and, 31
Stockdill, S., 56
Stufflebeam, D. L., 43
Suarez-Balcazar, Y., 94
Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 77
Summerhill, B., 21
Sutherland, S., 67
Systems theory, 20

T

Taut, S., 1, 56
Taylor, B., 21
Taylor, C., 21
Taylor-Powell, E., 2, 55, 59, 65, 69, 93, 106, 111, 113
Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF), 27–28
Terry, B. D., 19
Thomas, C., 30
Thornsbury, S., 92
Title I ESEA., 35
Toal, S. A., 91
Torres, R., 56
Torres, R. T., 1, 81
Townson, L., 2, 5, 14
Training/development, of ECB practitioners, 59
Trochim, W., 78
Trochim, W. M., 88

U

United Way of America, 21
University of Florida, 10
University of Wisconsin Extension's 4-H Youth Development program, 95–96
U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), 1, 7, 16, 30, 38n, 81
U.S. Department of Agriculture's Annual Performance Report, 33
U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB), 34, 35, 107, 111
U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO), 23

V

Vines, C. A.,
Volkov, B., 56, 58, 61, 62

W

W. K. Kellogg Foundation, 17, 21
Warner, P. D., 18, 22
Washington State Extension's Strengthening Families Program for Parents and Youth, 97
Washington State University, 9
Weerts, D. J., 92
Weiss, C. H., 35, 78, 108
Wessel, M., 16
Wessel, T., 16
Wholey, J., 21
Williams, B., 109
Worley, C. G., 42, 43

Z

Zuckerman, B., 59